Date:

7/7/2015

Agency Information

AGENCY: S

SSCIA

RECORD NUMBER:

157-10014-10128

RECORD SERIES:

MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS OF THE CHURCH COMMITTTEE

AGENCY FILE NUMBER:

Document Information

ORIGINATOR:

SSCIA

07-M-34

FROM:

TO:

TITLE:

DATE:

03/15/1976

PAGES:

76

SUBJECTS:

SSCSGO, METHODOLOGY

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

DOCUMENT TYPE:

TRANSCRIPT

CLASSIFICATION:

Declassified

RESTRICTIONS:

1B; 1C

CURRENT STATUS:

Redact

DATE OF LAST REVIEW:

03/22/2000

OPENING CRITERIA:

COMMENTS:

CCBOX 324

Date: 08/07/95

Page: 1

JFK ASSASSINATION SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION FORM

AGENCY INFORMATION

AGENCY : SSCIA

RECORD NUMBER: 157-10014-10128

RECORDS SERIES: MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS OF THE CHURCH COMMITTEE

AGENCY FILE NUMBER: 07-M-34

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

ORIGINATOR: SSCIA

FROM:
TO:
TITLE:

DATE: 03/15/76

PAGES: 76

SUBJECTS: SSCSGO, METHODOLOGY

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

DOCUMENT TYPE: TRANSCRIPT CLASSIFICATION: TOP SECRET RESTRICTIONS: REFERRED

CURRENT STATUS : POSTPONED IN FULL

DATE OF LAST REVIEW: 01/05/99

OPENING CRITERIA:

COMMENTS: CCBOX 324

Vol. 2 OF 3

NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION Unauthorized Disclosure Subject to Criminal Sanctions

The United States Senate R2832

Report of Proceedings

Hearing held before

Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities

Monday, March 15, 1976

Washington, D. C.

(Stenotype Tape and Waste turned over to the Committee for destruction)

WARD & PAUL

410 FIRST STREET, S. E. WASHINGTON, D. C. 20003

(202) 544-6000

TOP SECRET

DocId: 32423516 Page 3

TOP SECRET

Intelligence Investigation

2

1

Foreign & Military Subcommittee Meeting

3

Monday, March 15, 1976

6

7

United States Senate.

8

Select Committee to Study Governmental

9

Operations with Respect to

10

Intelligence Activities,

11

Washington, D. C.

12

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:20 o'clock

13

a.m., in Room S-407, the Capitol, Senator Walter D. Huddleston

14

(Chairman of the Subcommittee), presiding.

15

Present: Senators Huddleston (presiding) and Hart of

16

Colorado.

17

Also present: William Miller, Staff Director:

18

diGenova, Al Quanbeck, Rick Inderfurth, Charles Kirbow, Elizabeth

19

Culbreth, William Bader, David Aaron, Lynn Davis, Elliot Maxwell,

20

and Bob Kellev, Professional Staff Members.

21

22

23

24

PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Senator Huddleston. I think we can come to order, and I would expect that we could go through here pretty rapidly today.

There are only a couple of suggestions that I have.

Ms. Culbreth. Where are we starting?

Mr. Miller. Page 1.

Senator Huddleston. There is some suggestion that we should have some sort of a disclaimer-type thing some place. and I was wondering whether or not we couldn't add another paragraph after the second paragraph on page 1, something to the effect that it should be noted that while the Committee has diligently pursued its inquiry during the past year, there are areas of concern which time and personnel constraints did not permit thorough study and evaluation.

Also the Committee was hampered in a number of instances by a lack of accessibility to some documents and records either because it did not exist or because of unwillingness to make them available by the Executive Branch.

Some findings and recommendations of the Committee are based in part on information which must remain secret in accordance with the Committee's policy of protecting the valid security secrets.

> Are those three statements worth injecting there? Mr. Miller. They're all correct.

TOP SECRET

	Ms.	Culbre	th.	Could	you add	a sec	tion	that goe:	s to
our fi	inal	recomme	endati	ons tha	at some	thing	s exi	st but w	e don't
know c	ruite	where	to fi	nd ther	n? We	don't	know	exactly	how to
descri	ibe t	hem so	that	we can	be sur	e to c	et th	em. We	can
maybe	play	with t	hat a	little	a bit.				

Mr. diGenova. I thought that you meant that we didn't find access to them.

Mr. Miller. No. It's not being able to ask the right questions and the Agency's either being unwilling or unable to define what it is we are looking for.

Ms. Culbreth. There's something that they know they have somewhere but they don't know quite where it is because of their filing procedure or something.

Senator Huddleston. We could give two reasons for lack of accessibility, that they did exist and we couldn't get them and we could add a third, the Committee's inability to define.

Mr. diGenova. I have a problem with that, Senator, personally. I have never had an experience like that in terms of them not understanding.

I'm not saying it didn't happen but I tend to believe that if it happened it was basically for one of those two reasons, that they didn't want to make it available or it was a tug of war.

Can anyone remember an instance where we couldn't define what we wanted and they didn't understand and we never got it

TOD SECO

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

٦4

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

hecause of that?

Senator Huddleston. I think what Elizabeth is getting at is that there may be things that we did not touch that we don't know about.

Ms. Culbreth. Well, that kind of thing -- you see one of these final general recommendations we are making goes to requiring the Executive to register these classified things so that we can go look at it and know what it is that falls in that category.

Mr. dicenova. So what we're really talking about is something that neither of the parties may have known about either because of bad recordkeeping -- oh, okay, sure.

Mr. Kirbow. Senator, I have only one other position I would like to make on this.

I was trying to search my mind while you were talking about this. Have we yet failed to obtain anything either by request or by subpoena other than the Nixon papers which are not available because of an order of court?

Senator Huddleston. I will leave that to the Committee staff.

Mr. Miller. Yes, certain categories were absolutely denied us, absolutely denied us. Liaison arrangements, for example.

Mr. Davis. NSC papers.

Mr. Kirbow. Liaison papers is a thing that you remember

· ·

.

DocId:32423516 Page 7

1	early on last year they came and gave the Chairman and Vice
2	Chairman an extensive briefing on certain things and no longer
<u> </u>	did we deal in those areas.

Mr. Miller. No, but you see, and that's one area but there are others.

For example, in the present inquiry on academics and so on we were stopped beyond a certain point. There was no entry.

Mr. Davis. There are also some NSC studies that we never got.

Mr. diGenova. Yes, and the general study of command control, that task force which generally do not access to NSC minutes.

The only time we ever got access to NSC minutes was on the assassination report. That's the only place we had full access and even then they were edited minutes of things arguably unrelated to Cuba.

Mr. Kirbow. I think I must say that we did not subpoena those documents.

In other words, at some point it was difficult perhaps to get some of them but I just don't recall a single instance where vou asked the Vice Chairman to sign on a subpoena or to warn them that he was going to issue it, that they didn't thereafter deliver.

I don't disagree that we may not have done in the depth that we should have in those but I just didn't think it was a

7.

1.1

matter of a record for the Committee of refusal except on the Nixon papers, but if I am wrong --

Senator Huddleston. They wouldn't give us the names of the journalists.

I think we're not saying here that it was unjutified unwillingness or even an arbitrary one. We're just saying here that there were some things that they didn't want the Committee to have. That's just what I'm trying to get at in case something explodes two weeks from now that we have not touched at all.

That kind of gives us an out that we did the best we could on the basis of what we got, we made our findings and recommendations.

But there are some areas which we can't be sure that we knew everything.

Mr. Kirbow. Senator, in talking about this type of insert paragraph, and I'm not sure where Mr. Miller would think it would belong, but I think that we should at this point consider the recommendation that I guess you made or adopted that on certain of these citations where we are not going to put them into your certain comments, that we should make notice now to the reader that there is a classified group of recommendations or a classified group of papers which are not in this document which support some of the findings and cite them back to a classified file in the Committee's files.

I'm not sure where it would go.

TAD SECDET

וו

Senator Huddleston. Well, it would be logical to follow that where I say some findings and recommendations are based in part on information that must remain secret following the Committee's policy to protect valid security secrets.

Also what I'm referring to here is that there may be recommendations in here that are not truly backed up by the information we can give them. That's what that sentence is supposed to mean, and the next sentence ought to be that there are also some recommendations that are not made public essentially for the same reason. We could add that sentence to this and I think that would do it.

Mr. Aaron. There is one footnote in here that explains or that goes to the liaison point, for example, that explains that we have a more detailed recommendation, but the footnote really is to come out of the final version.

The footnote is really only for the Committee as it considers the paper.

Mr. Kirbow. I like that additional paragraph there and the word about some classified recommendations being made both to the Senate and to the Executive Branch.

Mr. Miller. Mr. Chairman, in looking this over I think perhaps another paragraph would be in order really pointing out that what these recommendations are, in effect, are an agenda for action for the oversight committee in the next vear or so and also for the Executive Branch, and that in these

TOD CECDET

DocId:32423516 Page 10

1.3

TOP SECRET

recommendations have been cast in such a form as to provide an agenda or an outline for the future, that that really has been the thrust of this section of the paper.

Mr. Kirbow. I especially like that form, Mr. Chairman, because many committees are expected to introduce or to submit legislative proposals and that is not the intention, apparently, of this Committee or subcommittee and I would like some reference made to that.

Senator Huddleston. I think that paragraph would go either as a continuation of the third paragraph, which ends up on page 2, or an additional paragraph following it.

Mr. Aaron. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that in addition to that point, which I think is a very important one. in order to explain what it is the Committee has tried to accomplish in this area, that we also make the point that the simple or not so simple laying out of the facts as we were able to discover them and run the gambit and process of declassification, the simple facts laid out are a major contribution to public and Congressional understanding of this enormously complex and difficult operation.

I think that as a Committee it ought to be proud. not only of the recommendations it makes for changes but the extent to which it was able to come to grips with the reality of what the intelligence communities and activities are.

The first task of a Congressional investigative committee

is to inform the public and I think that was done quite well.

.2

Senator Huddleston. Shouldn't that also come there in this first section before we get to the general facts?

3

Mr. Aaron. Yes, I believe that's correct. I would sugges

5

that we just get together and try to redraft three or four

6

pages that would capture all those points in some logical

7

sequence as an introduction to this.

8

Senator Huddleston. I still have my same suggestion relative to the second complete paragraph on page 2 where we

9

10

find that there is a need in the future.

11

there. I think I suggested the other time that we say the

I still think the sentence is a little out of order

12 13

Committee finds there is a continuing need. And then the

14

next sentence gets into the future that there will be a

15

challenge for the foreseeable future.

16

So we would strike out in the future in the first

17

sentence and put continuing need.

intelligence agencies.

the Committee's --

18

the bottom of the page. It has over the past 35 years --

which carries over to page 5 should probably be, the failure

of Congress as a whole to monitor the expenditures of

Mr. Aaron. We have a funny fragment of a sentence at

Mr. Maxwell. The bottom of page 4, the last sentence

19

20

21

22

23

24

Senator Huddleston. In other words, you want to exonerate

TOP SECRET

1	Mr. Maxwell. Well, I think that the Appropriations
2	Committee would probably have a good claim to say that they
3	have looked at intelligence as a whole. The Congress certainly
4	hasn't as a whole.
5	Mr. Aaron. I wanted to ask a question with regard to
6	that one thing, that one paragraph, whether we really shouldn't
7	be making some reference at this point to the Constitutional
8	issue about the budget.
- 1	

Now I know these are general findings and they are amplified later, but whether or not we are adequately fulfilling our Constitutional responsibility --

Senator Huddleston. Later on we quote that paragraph.

Mr. Aaron. That's correct.

Senator Huddleston. Well, I think that is not only because of the magnitude and character but also because of the Constitution, which we could add to that very sentence. They are of such nature and the Constitution makes such requirements.

Mr. Kirbow. We should be careful lumping the magnitude and the Constitutional requirements together as if the Constitution requires it. And the magnitude of it should be discussed also. So we should just be careful about the wording.

Mr. Aaron. We're now into page 6, I think.

Senator Huddleston. Gary, do you have anything specific?
Senator Hart. No.

. .

23516 Page 13

1.8

TOP SECRET

	Mr. Aaron. The first point at which we have, and this
is	a question of how you would like to proceed, we can go back
to	look at the various bracketed languages that are left in
the	e paper and see if we want them to remain that way and/or
we:	can take up any further comments that people have.

I only have two small comments concerning the papers which were brought to my attention in the course of the day. I also must say that despite repeated requests to include at an appropriate place some of the recommendations that the Chairman has made, I'm sorry to say that that has not yet happened here, so we have to make appropriate provision for those. And they will go in at the appropriate place.

Mr. Kirbow. Chairman of the Subcommittee?

Mr. Aaron. Chairman of the Full Committee.

Mr. Miller. One of them as I recall has to do with the question that we went over -- what he, Inthink, feels strongly about is the tenure of office of the director.

Mr. Kirbow. Of the CIA?

Mr. Miller. Yes. That would just be a bracket for the Full Committee.

Mr. Kirbow. What is his suggestion?

Mr. Miller. I think seven years.

Mr. Kirbow. Does the lame duck administration and lame duck officeholders create any problem for you?

Mr. Miller. Well, it's the degree to which the official

-

l6 Page 1

is political.

Mr. Kirbow. Who would you get to fill the job for that last year in an administration?

Mr. Miller. If it's a fixed term, it really doesn't matter, does it? If he's there straddling in order to provide transition, that's the idea rather than starting with cleaning out the Director at the beginning of each administration. There ought to be continuity, and that would tend to depoliticize That is his notion. the office.

Senator Huddleston. I think we hassled with that for quite a while. It goes in a bracket and we'll just have to see how persuasive he is.

Mr. Aaron. Also in the cover section we have a sentence regarding international terrorism and linking that up with the assassination of Richard Welch. It did not come out as it was supposed to, so it should be deleted.

Mr. Inderfurth. That's page 83, and I think there was also the decision to take out the reference to Welch not moving out of his house.

Mr. Aaron. No, that's not correct.

Mr. diGenova. I thought we did agree to do that. I think the Senator took exception to the inference that might have been drawn from the direct quotation that we were trying to say it wasn't our fault and this was the reason sort of thing We were going to paraphrase that was where we left it.

٦

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DocId:32423516 Page 15

1.1

Mr. Aaron. Well, I would oppose that but I will be guided by the Committee.

Senator Huddleston. Has this been altered since our discussion?

Mr. Aaron. Yes, there was alteration in the text that preceded it.

Before it said that the tragic death of the station chief in Athens illustrates the problem of striking a balance between cover and operations. And what we're simply saving here is that his situation in Athens illustrates the problem of cover and I think that these further points do make that clear.

On the one hand we have the testimony of the chief of the cover staff that by the time we get to the station chief there isn't a great deal of cover left, and one illustration of that is the fact that he moved into a house occupied by the previous station chief.

There was some question as to whether he should stay
in it or not and it was generally felt he should make his
own decision about it and, you know, for all the inconvenience
and difficulty that might be entailed he just as soon stayed
there.

This is the kind of feeling that one has about it and it does illustrate the problem. The implication is not that he was killed because he moved into that house. It was really just the way of describing the situation which station chiefs face

TAD CEADE

. 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

when they're trying to deal with questions of cover versus questions of convenience or operation and necessity.

Mr. Kirbow. I also have the same objection on page 84 where the Chairman said we didn't clearly define that terrorists killed the man, then we shouldn't infer that it did.

We can talk about terrorism being an additional problem for all cover, but not as it directly relates to Welch.

Mr. Aaron. The sentence preceding it was modified to make that point and the last sentence should have been deleted and it was not. The quote.

Senator Huddleston. Yes, I recall there was some question about the quote because it seemed to tie him in both with the cover and terrorism.

Mr. Maxwell. I think in regard to the first quote, I think we make the point in the sentence directly preceding it and there is some question as to whether in the cover section we would like to place so much emphasis on Mr. Welch's death, and essentially by adding the quote sav, listen, it wasn't us, it wasn't us, guys. He takes it on his head.

Mr. Aaron. I don't see that you have to read it that way. I simply feel it adds a certain specificity to otherwise sort of general comments.

Mr. Kirbow. Well, it wasn't objectionable to the Chairman and I don't see that it contributes anything more than the fact that official cover is very light by the time you get to

TAD CECDET

1 | the station chief, which you see in the first sentence.

I wouldn't think that taking it out detracts from the paper in any way.

Mr. Aaron. Whatever the Chairman wishes.

Senator Huddleston. It seems to me that we also talk about the fact that both his predecessor and his name had been carried in foreign newspapers as an indication too of the lack of deep cover.

Mr. Aaron. I tried to do that with one sentence just saying further, Mr. Welch occupied the house which had been publicly identified as that of the preceding station chief which sort of sweeps up both thoughts, that both he and the previous station chief had been identified publicly.

Mr. diGenova. I believe what that sentence does is summarize what comes in the next paragraph which is the direct quote. I think we can cut out from the word "according" to the word "house," because really, all that does is just reemphasiz the same point.

Mr. Kirbow. I would agree with that.

Mr. diGenova. The sentence is an excellent summary, the textual sentence is an excellent summary, but I don't know.

Mr. Kirbow. Mr. Chairman, I suggest we delete the sentence starting with the word "according" and down through and including the word "house."

Senator Huddleston. If we're going to use Mr. Welch's

2

3

4

6

8

10

٦٦

12

.13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

.21

22

23

25

TOP SECRET

name, we have to identify who he was.

Mr. Kirbow. We can do that where we say station chief in the first sentence. We could say Richard Welch the station chief in Athens.

Ms. Culbreth. Mr. Chairman, on that point I have one question. I don't know whether there has been any official announcement by anybody in our government that Mr. Welch was in fact the station chief.

I know the President went and I know Mr. Colby went, but I still don't know that there's been any official written government document that said yes, we recognize this man.

The only reason I raise this is just for the Senators to decide whether they want to put that in our report, if in fact neither the Agency or the Executive has done that.

Mr. diGenova. I would only say this. At no time during my review of the cover paper did the Agency ever say to me that you should not say that Richard Welch was the station chief.

That was the one thing they never objected to.

Really, in the whole cover paper, that was the only thing they never mentioned. That's just not a problem.

Mr. Aaron. I would like to make one suggestion, if the suggestion of Mr. Kirbow is accepted, and that is that the sentence preceding it be modified to indicate that Mr. Welch didn't just decide to do it out of thin air. He decided because he was asked not to do it or it was suggested that he consider

not doing it anyway.

The point of the further sentence is not just that he decided to move into the house. That might be normal operating procedure.

Mr. diGenova. I think it does add one dimension and that is which shows that, as Mr. Isenstead testified, operations and cover work hand in hand, and the DDO will oftentimes overrule the chief of cover and commercial and will sometimes back him up and sometimes the individual station chief is left to make his own decision but it does add that dimension to it, which is the decisional process.

Thought was given, in other words, to the question of whether or not his cover would be undermined by staying there.

Mr. Aaron. I'd be happy to put it in that further, though headquarters raised questions, Mr. Welch decided to occupy the house.

Senator Huddleston. I think it would be appropriate to do that.

Mr. Aaron. Let me suggest in the interest of trying to get through all the material that we have this morning, that there are two sections that we do need to look at carefully.

One I take it is the redone section on media, particularly the recommendations and the second is the paper on Department of State and ambassadors, which I think has been gone over in nine different ways by the staff, and I'm sure that there are

End 1A, b 13

3.

TOP SECRET

still more comments.

Mr. Inderfurth. Defense just came as well.

Mr. Aaron. The Defense one may well need more staff work.

What I would recommend is that we turn to the section on media, unless there are major further questions. That would be on page 66.

Senator Hart. Mr. Chairman, before we move, could I raise one interim — a sticky question of prior notification is addressed at the bottom of page 16, recommendation 14, and the question is whether we should nail that admonition down perhaps as follows, except that by statute Congress should be notified.

As you know, the resolution leaves the matter vague on the oversight committee.

Mr. Kirbow. I agree with Senator Hart, that we initially start it off with the Committee in a bill and it got changed to a resolution which is not binding on the Administration and the Committee has not changed its mind and it should again recommend that that be enacted.

Mr. diGenova. Just put the word "by statute?"

Senator Hart. That by statute Congress should.

Mr. Inderfurth. A couple of little things on that same page under recommendation 11, the last sentence -- the President also should continue to certify covert action projects as provided by and we might add in there certify covert action

TOD CECDET

.8

States. I think that clarifies what the certification is.

Just certifying you don't, you don't know what that means.

Mr. Aaron. Page 66, I think Bill Bader would like to --

Mr. Bader. I turn the Senators' attention to page 69 and page 70. We'll go first to the covert use of the U.S. academic community and then the second issue is the use of the media.

As you see on 69 we have given an outline of the extent of operational use of American academics.

I should say that both, for the record, that both at the appearance of representatives of FRD when they came here and Bill Nelson, the deputy director for operations, has subsequently submitted a paper which gives the Agency's position and very strongly recommends a continuation of this operational use of academics and speaks to what they consider the very important costs that would flow from any prohibition of the use of American academics.

I would note that on page 69 there has been the addition of two or three sentences at the bottom of the page which reflects the facts that were given to us by FRD when they came to that hearing whenever it was last Friday.

I'll read those.

" Of all these activities, the CIA gives its highest priority and assigns its best case officers to the recruitment

(1)

7.

TOP SECRET

of fore:	ign students.	More than on	e half of	CIA's case off	icer
working	within the U.	S., are assign	ed to thi	s task. Over 6	0
percent	of CIA recrui	tments within	the U.S.	last year were	,
foreign	students."				

This is directly from the transcript.

Mr. Miller. But is it clear?

Mr. Kirbow. This manuscript has not gone for sanitization?

Mr. Bader. No.

Mr. Miller. Would it clear, then? What is your guess? My guess is no.

Mr. Bader. Well, it should be said at this point that in the critique that came back from the Agency on the entire larger Katzenbach paper the Agency has taken the position that any mention of numbers or the fact that the Central Intelligence Agency uses academics for operational purposes, they've put in the category of sources and methods, and there should be no public reference to it.

Senator Huddleston. Well, we'll have to face that problem in the Full Committee.

Mr. Kirbow. That's the testimony of the witness who was before the Committee just last week when he was asked that specific question, that what harm would accrue if someone published the members of institutions or kind of the scope of this whole program?

TOD CHORPE

He expressed serious reservations at that time.

Mr. Bader. That's a problem we have to face up to.

Now on page 70 there are two paragraphs that are bracketed there which I turn the Senator's attention to, and these are findings, these are obviously alternatives. The first finding is that the Committee holds to the view that the American academics provide invaluable and necessary assistance in the initial recruiting stage of foreign students.

These foreign students produce important and valuable intelligence when returned to their countries. The role of cooperating academics is limited to passive observation and therefore it does not undermine the ideals and integrity of American universities.

The other side of that is the following: The Committee holds to the view that American academics should not be drawn into clandestine -- which is underlined -- operations such as recruiting of agents among foreign students, writing propaganda or serving as intelligence collectors overseas.

Such activities undermine public confidence that those who train our young are upholding the ideals of American universities.

Now from that and these findings, flow these recommendations and there is a glitch in the recommendations. 43, above 43 should be marked options, and these options, the paragraphs that follow are in fact options rather than individual recommendations.

TAR CERRET